



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,199	01/28/2004	Seng Beng Ho	247569US-8 DIV	1134
22850	7590	03/18/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.				LUU, SY D
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2174		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
03/18/2008			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,199	HO, SENG BENG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sy D. Luu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 30-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 30-33 and 35-56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 34 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/28/04,3/24/04,4/28/04,8/11/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 30-33, 35-37, 42, and 49-56 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of Ho (U.S. Patent No. 6,976,225) in view of Knowton (US 5,283,864).

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 1 of Ho, except the step of displaying said set of information as a book image, respective portions of said set of information being displayed as an open page of said book image that overlaps another page that was previously moved from a first side of said book to a second side of said book, and open pages of said book remain at a fixed location with respect to said display screen as different pages of said book image are displayed. However, Knowlton teaches a similar method comprising displaying said set of information as a book image, respective portions of said set of information being displayed as an open page of said book image that overlaps another page that was previously moved from a first side of said book to a second side of said book (figs. 2A-2I), and open pages of said book remain at a fixed location with respect to said display screen as different pages of said book image are displayed (figs. 2A-2I). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Knowlton's teaching with Ho's method in order to enhance user's interaction experience with the usage operations.

As per claims 31-32 and 35-36, Knowlton teaches the method of Claim 21, wherein: said finger-bookmark disappears when a bookmarked page is revisited (see Knowlton, column 13,

lines 31 - 35); and said permanent bookmark does not disappear when a permanently bookmarked page is revisited (see Knowlton, figure 2F, the tabs do not disappear when their corresponding page is displayed).

As per claims 33 and 37, Knowlton teaches the steps of jumping to a predetermined jump position in said set of information, and displaying a jump cursor on the thickness image, said jump cursor being user-activated and identifying a location in the set of information in which to effect a jump operation, and said jump cursor showing a location in the set of information to which the jump operation will be made (fig. 2E; col. 9, lines 34-58; col. 2, lines 42-61).

As per claim 42, Knowlton further teaches the step of displaying a flipping of a thickness image of pages skipped over in said jumping step (col. 6, line 35 through col. 7, line 5).

Claims 49-55 are similar in scope to claims 31-33, 35-36 and 42, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 56 is similar in scope to claim 30, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

3. Claims 38-39, 40-41, and 43-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of Ho (U.S. Patent No. 6,976,225) in view of Knowton (US 5,283,864) and Henckel (“Henckel”, US 5,463,725).

As per claims 38-39 and 41, Knowlton teaches the steps of displaying two flipping pages simultaneously (figure 2B and column 8, line 47 - column 9, line 7), said two flipping pages showing information from corresponding parts of said set of information while flipping (column 8, line 63 - column 9, line 7). Ho and Knowlton do not teach displaying more than two flipping

pages simultaneously. Henckel teaches displaying more than two flipping pages simultaneously (figure 4, pages 103, 103, 256 and 257 and column 4, lines 25 - 36). It would have been obvious to artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Henckel with the method of Ho and Knowlton in order to provide page location information.

As per claim 40, Knowlton teaches the steps of freezing a number of flipping pages in an act of flipping across the computer screen (see Knowlton, column 9, lines 28 - 33). Ho and Knowlton do not teach freezing a number of flipping pages in an act of flipping across the computer screen in response to receiving a freeze command issued by a user. Henckel teaches freezing a number of flipping pages in an act of flipping across the computer screen in response to receiving a freeze command issued by a user (see Henckel, column 3, lines 5 - 10). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Henckel with the method of Ho and Knowlton in order to provide a more intuitive and realistic user interface.

Claims 43-46 and 48 are similar in scope to claims 30 and 38-41, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 47, Henckel teaches the step of collapsing a number of flipping pages into a collection of pages (fig. 1; *a set of pages that are collected in a thick page shown as element 24 combined with element 102*).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 34 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4064**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:300 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sy D. Luu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

Application Number 	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination
	10/765,199	HO, SENG BENG
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sy D. Luu	2174	